

Panel Session Interpretive Transcript*

**Building the Next Update (2023) of the Water Plan
from the Local/Regional Level Up**

California Water Plan Update 2018

Second Plenary Meeting

September 27, 2017

McClellan Conference Center, Sacramento

Description: During this session, panelists focused on how the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) can best engage local and regional stakeholders to build the 2023 update of the California Water Plan from the “bottom up”. Panel members shared ideas about how stakeholders can help DWR synthesize local and regional water management needs and goals from local/regional scales to the major hydrologic area and statewide scales. The future development of the California regional water management atlas was also discussed.

Moderator:** Tracy Hemmeter; Senior Project Manager, Santa Clara Valley Water District and Co-chair of the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Roundtable of Regions

Panelists** (speaking order):

Lewis Moeller; Project Manager, California Water Plan, DWR

Colin Bailey; Executive Director, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water

Dana Frieauf; Water Resources Manager, San Diego County Water Authority

(speaking in place of Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority)

Lynn Rodriguez; Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County and Co-Chair of

IRWM Roundtable of Regions

Brad Sherwood - Community and Government Affairs Manager, Sonoma County Water Agency

Sherri Norris – Executive Director, California Indian Environmental Alliance

* This “interpretive transcript” of the subject panel session is not a verbatim record. Changes were made between the panel session recording and this written record for the sake of readability and understanding. Careful consideration was given to preserving the original content and meaning of each speaker’s contribution. The panel session recording is available at:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6pEqKX1Wufg>

** Biographical summaries are presented on Pages 19 through 21.

Tracy Hemmeter – Introduction

I was speaking previously with one of the panel members and we both agreed that building the 2023 update of the California Water Plan from the local/regional level up is a great idea, so then the question becomes: what is it that the panel needs to address? I contacted all the panel members and mentioned that DWR would be giving a presentation on what is meant by building the water plan from the bottom up. We all then agreed that each panelist would speak from their own perspectives on how we make sure that everyone is represented in that plan development process. Panel members will, depending on their roles and experiences, share their perspectives from the standpoint of individual or multiple IRWM regions, Tribes, hydrologic areas, statewide issues, or other concerns.

Mike Floyd (DWR) - Set Up Presentation***

I think that the concept of building the 2023 update of the Water Plan from the bottom up is a great one, but there will be challenges that we need to start figuring out. That's why we asked these great panelists here today.

[**Slide 3** – Note: To see the slide number at the web address in the footnote*** below, please hover the cursor over the bottom portion of the slides as they appear on the screen.]

The concept for the integrated regional water management atlas [which will serve as a foundation for the 2023 update] was introduced during the development of the stakeholder perspectives document [*Stakeholder Perspectives – Recommendations for Sustaining and Strengthening Integrated Regional Water Management*****]. The stakeholder perspectives document development effort was an extensive multi-year project where DWR engaged IRWM practitioners and other stakeholders across the state to determine how IRWM can be sustained and strengthened, now and in the future.

[Slide 4]

DWR received a lot of input related to the regional water management atlas concept

*** The slides used for this presentation can be viewed at:

http://www.water.ca.gov/waterplan/docs/cwpu2018/plenary/sep2017/presentations/02_Update2018_Plenary_Sept2017_WaterPlan_LocalRegional_Session.pdf

**** https://www.water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/irwm/docs/IRWM_Recommendations.pdf

during the stakeholder perspectives document development process. The atlas' purpose is to describe [under one cover]--who the IRWM regions are, where they are, what they do, and what their goals, needs, and priorities are.

The idea for the atlas came from stakeholders. The atlas is identified as part of one of the 70 actions listed in the stakeholder perspectives document. The document specifically identifies the state as needing to “*Publish and maintain a web-based atlas summarizing the makeup of IRWM regions across the state, and their water management challenges and successes.*”

[Slide 5]

A few years ago, we [DWR] offered up a trial concept [prototype] for the atlas. To do this, we initially focused on the American River Basin. The idea was to digest the information in the American River Basin IRWM Plan into a “bite-sized chunk”, and then do the same for IRWM regions across California. Unfortunately, we were not able to continue with that effort because of funding issues, but we're back at it now.

[Slide 6]

We are going to relaunch the atlas effort again soon and our [updated] idea for the content of the summaries for each IRWM region includes: the characteristics of the region, what the regional water management group is and who is involved, key water management needs and challenges, and other items [shown on slide—regional alignment needs, major IRWM milestones/achievements, inter-regional management needs/actions, and project/investment needs].

[Slides 7 & 8]

Now I'm going to talk about rolling up this regional level information to a higher level. So where does this concept come from? The answer is that, during the development of the stakeholder perspectives document, we were told that DWR needs to better align its programs to support IRWM. One of those alignment issues is the California Water Plan update.

The comment from IRWM practitioners shown on the screen --“*We spend a huge amount of time, energy, and resources developing and implementing IRWM plans, so why don't you (the state) use them to inform state plans policies, and investments?*” --

paraphrases what we heard from people. So, we [DWR] say, “amen to that” and now let us figure out a way to do it—that is why we’re here today.

[Slide 9]

Our initial concept for bringing regional information together is to do it for each of the state’s [ten] hydrologic areas, like the Central Coast Hydrologic Area shown on the screen. That’s just one concept for bringing information together at the next level up from IRWM regions, but it could be something else [some other level/area]. That’s something we want to engage stakeholders on and include in today’s conversation—what’s that next level up? We also need to hear how information from the regional level can be synthesized at the next level up [such as the hydrologic area] to develop common themes, needs, etcetera.

Once the area for that “next level up” from IRWM regions is defined, our idea for synthesizing information at the next level is to bring people together along with the information that is needed [IRWM plans/atlas content, inter-IRWM region/hydrologic area scale information, information for areas outside of IRWM regions, etc.]. From that, a synthesis report for the area would be developed. DWR would engage a team of stakeholders to help write the area report.

[Slides 10, 11, & 12]

Then, from the hydrologic area level, we go up to the state level. The next part of this concept is to take all the hydrologic area synthesis reports (or reports for some other division of the state), reports from possible overlay areas, such as the mountain counties and the delta, and other pertinent information and then conduct a statewide summit. The purpose of the summit is to work with stakeholders to evaluate all this information, determine what rises to the top at the statewide level, and develop the statewide synthesis report. That synthesis report, combined with state policy and plans informed by the statewide synthesis, would be the California Water Plan.

In concept, this approach for developing the Water Plan seems pretty straightforward, but in practice, I can guarantee you it will be difficult, but, in my opinion, very worthwhile.

[Slide 13]

We plan on completing the design of the regional water management atlas in early 2018, and then, by sometime in late 2018 or early 2019, we will initiate the regional forums and begin the process for Water Plan Update 2023.

Tracy Hemmeter

I now would like each of the panelists to share their perspectives on how building the Water Plan from the bottom up will work.

Lewis Moeller

We just heard from someone from DWR about the atlas and the process for developing Water Plan Update 2023. I want to keep my comments a little short and underscore that the atlas is the way to go.

We, the Water Plan Team, have observed many times that implementation starts at the regional scale—that's where most efforts are taking place, and that's where most of the issues are. So, we must recognize this and reflect it in the Water Plan. Every time we have used the state level down approach it hasn't worked as well.

I would like to point out the five themes in the current draft of the Water Plan being circulated now. They are on Page 3-3 of the draft. That's a good place to start looking at the draft plan.

[Note: The five themes, now referred to as "goals" for Water Plan Update 2018, are:

- Improve Alignment of Agencies' Initiatives and Governance
- Improve the Regulatory Framework to Reconcile Environmental Needs and Human Activities
- Provide Resources, Knowledge, Skills, and Tools Water Managers Need for Data-driven Decision Making
- Provide Sufficient and Stable Funding
- Modernize and Rehabilitate Water Resource Management Systems.]

A lot of what I heard at the earlier session applies to what the state's role should be—using dollars as incentives, alignment; taking a holistic approach for data, governance, etc.; setting limits, etc. I'm only picking the roles that the Water Plan may have a need to address. And then there's the issue of setting the proper scale for how we look at things, and for rolling information up. There's a scale that is going to work, not too detailed, yet maybe not as high as the ten hydrologic regions?

Colin Bailey

For those unfamiliar with Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, we work with low resource environmental justice communities around the state.

I have been involved with the 2013, and now the 2018 update of the Water Plan. Within that timeframe, I have witnessed a tremendous pendulum swing in terms of the plan development process. I think I can characterize the 2013 update effort as being driven by specific constituencies or caucus'. I participated as part of the environmental justice and disadvantaged community (DAC) caucus. There were other caucuses, including a tribal caucus, and several others.

The process for the 2013 update produced a water plan that most would agree included a tremendous volume of recommendations that were almost unusable in their number, and a plan that was not as well organized as we might have liked.

I also now serve with many others at the invitation of DWR on the policy advisory committee for the Water Plan. That process is on the other end of the pendulum swing-- it is a fairly small group of people bringing forward their insights who are largely at the top of their respective organizations. We have yet to have those broader, grassroots conversations. It remains to be seen what the ultimate product of those conversations will be for the 2018 update.

So, my comments on the process [described earlier] are going to draw from my organization's background as a hub organization that does community organizing and movement building. There are pillars and principles that I think might be applicable here, some of which I heard in Mike's presentation.

First, for our constituencies, you have to provide the necessary support for engagement. Engagement doesn't happen without trust and a relationship development exercise. There's a capacity-building component from which we now have a real opportunity in the disadvantaged community involvement program to leverage both relationships and trust. Capacity will be built from each of the ongoing conversations as we raise everybody's water IQ, as it were, to really understand the bigger picture.

Another principle of organizing that I think is pertinent here is that people organize around their own self-interest. To understand what that interest is, you really need to have a relationship with folks.

The third principle (that relates to the two former principles) is that it's easier to organize those who are already organized and where there are already relationships. So, you do go to leaders (as we have done with the current water plan policy advisory committee), however you want to make sure that they, as leaders, are bringing with them the followers and people who reach out to them where there is trust. So, there are any number of groups, many of which are represented here, where you can do that. These groups can include the groundwater sustainability agencies, California Urban Water Agencies, Association of California Water Agencies, resource conservation districts, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, tribal associations, and, of course, the IRWM regions. Hopefully, at the end of the disadvantaged communities' involvement program, the IRWM regions will be more deeply integrated with disadvantaged communities and Tribes.

Another observation that I have as a newcomer to the Water Plan effort, is that it's good to have a real clear purpose and vision. I'm open to suggestions as to what the ultimate value of the state Water Plan has been in the past, and what it will be in the future. We've had some discussions, of course, on what the vision and purpose of the new iteration of the Water Plan will be, but our constituents really need to have a clear idea about all that upfront because time is precious and choices must be made.

Regarding Mike's slides about his structure for leveraging up from smaller to larger conversations, we, in community organizing, call that a fractal or a snowflake model, which I think is a good element of what's been presented. The idea is that you have a structure for a conversation at a very small scale that then ratchets up to larger scales. In our work, we do that starting with local chapters that sometimes are at the community-based level. We then have someone who's responsible as a facilitator/coordinator to have people come together at a regional level, usually at the hydrologic area level, or sometimes at the IRWM level. From there, the conversation ratchets up to the statewide level with the addition of cross-cutting issue workshops/workgroups.

I think it was Martha Davis who mentioned earlier the value of good facilitation and coordination support. I just cannot hammer that home enough. Good facilitation and coordination support also mean having someone who's culturally competent, and that can mean any culture. It took me a long time to figure out how to talk to engineers and I've also learned to speak "Central Valley-ian" in various ways. To Director Davis, I didn't get the chance to mention this earlier, but we do need to get Anecita Agustinez (DWR's Tribal Liaison) involved in deeper and broader ways, so let's find out how to get her more support.

Dana Friehauf

Before I get into our perspective, I want to touch on the San Diego IRWM Region and our region's governance, because it really plays into our perspective on this issue.

We have a regional water management group that consists of the city San Diego, San Diego County, and the San Diego County Water Authority. We also formed a regional advisory committee, which is very critical to the success of our program. The committee consist of 36 individual stakeholders. It's a very diverse group and includes representatives of disadvantaged communities, Tribes, nongovernmental organizations, the building industry association, and water agencies.

Regarding governance, we've been fortunate to collaborate very well within the funding area with both the Upper Santa Margarita and the South Orange County Watershed Management Area IRWM Regions. We came together and have an agreement for the allocation of IRWM grant funds for our funding area.

I think we have been fortunate to have a solid IRWM governance structure in San Diego County, which is why we've been so successful in our efforts. I think we've secured over \$96 million in funding for the region.

Regarding the region itself, there's good and bad. We are not like the Santa Ana watershed--we don't just have one watershed. We have eleven watersheds, so when we talk about "big picture" planning being by watershed, that really does not make sense for San Diego County. For us, the IRWM region makes more sense and it does consider jurisdictional boundaries. So, from our perspective, while our IRWM plan includes a watershed-based approach and can show what's happening in each of those watersheds, such as water quality and environmental issues, our IRWM planning region makes sense from the big water supply perspective.

Regarding our supply portfolio, which plays into our perspective, we have diversified that portfolio tremendously since the early 90s, but we still rely on imported water for a majority of our supply. We also don't have a lot of groundwater and a large groundwater basin to manage, which is another reason we look more at the IRWM region for planning.

We fully support DWR's effort to develop the 2023 update of the Water Plan from the bottom up. I think this is the approach we need to take.

There are some questions that we've been asking ourselves about this approach. The first one is: what level [next level up from IRWM regions] should information be collected? Should it be at the hydrologic region, the funding area, or the planning area region?

I think Mr. Davis mentioned that maybe the hydrologic region isn't appropriate, and I think we would agree with that. I went back to the 2013 Water Plan update and looked at the hydrologic region report [for our part of California]. There was a lot of discussion in the report on groundwater, which makes sense considering you're looking at the whole hydrologic region, but for us, the report just didn't touch on our issues.

I think, at a minimum, we need to go down to the funding areas, if not the planning areas themselves. I could envision where, even though there's 48 planning areas, we could have a short synopsis of the issues and then have a link to the IRWM plan for more information, such as population, statistics, and issues. I think that way you'll really tap into what the true issues are within all the regions, and you can build upon that. By taking this approach, you could have an overall pick of the similarities between those planning areas, and then have a kind of synopsis of what that looks like statewide.

The second question is: how do we balance the need for consistency between IRWM plans so that we can have some consistent information, but also account for the fact that one size doesn't fit all when it comes to the IRWM regions? What we may highlight as important in our region could be very different for another region. That's something we need to talk about.

Lynn Rodriguez

I will speak briefly about my IRWM region for those of you that are not already aware of it. The Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County IRWM Region has about 860,000 people and is, I think, a microcosm of almost all IRWM regions in California. We have agriculture, mountainous areas, some high desert, different microclimates, coastal areas groundwater, sea water intrusion, surface water, and imported water. We have a mix of issues and projects like elsewhere in the state.

I have been involved in the Water Plan process since the end of the 2005 Water Plan update. I took the 2005 Water Plan update that had just been freshly minted, and other documents at the state level, and felt like that was a good starting point to "raise the water IQ" in my region and help us develop our IRWM plan. People do get a little insular with the issues in their own area. I thought it was good to share the work that the state had done with the folks in our county.

We have a bottom-up approach in our IRWM region. We have three major watersheds and some smaller coastal watersheds, but the three major watersheds are the planning units for our IRWM effort. As Colin Bailey pointed out so well, people are much more likely to gravitate toward what matters to them. Geographically speaking, it's easier to get people to care about what's happening in their watershed than it is to get them to care about what's happening countywide, let alone at the hydrologic region or statewide scale.

Regarding the question of scale, I think you shouldn't go too big. I would say that even the funding area is the wrong scale. We're in the Los Angeles - Ventura funding area. We're next to Los Angeles County, but we are quite different. We share some common interests and certain watershed boundaries, but our needs differ. We are struggling a little bit with the disadvantaged community involvement process. We need to make sure that we're meeting everybody's needs, but that's tough when Ventura County and Los Angeles County are so vastly different in terms of population. Los Angeles County is a very urban area while Ventura County is more rural and agricultural, and contains smaller communities.

I have heard from members of the IRWM Roundtable of Regions about scale when it comes to Proposition 1. The concern is whether we can come to agreement on what the greatest needs are across funding areas. I've heard some people say that they can't get people within their own IRWM regions to agree on needs. I think the smaller the scale, and the more people can relate to the issues being addressed, the better. I would say the watershed scale may not work everywhere because of the variation in watersheds--between the smaller ones like in San Diego County and the large ones in other areas, like Santa Ana.

I don't know that I have an answer to the "next level up" question, but I do very much support the bottom-up approach.

We now have the added challenge of addressing the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). Developing groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) and groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs), which many of us in the IRWM regions are engaged in in one way or another, can fracture stakeholders in the IRWM regions into smaller groups, pulling them away from active engagement in IRWM. In some regions, staffing resources aren't sufficient to develop a GSP at the same time you're working on IRWM implementation. The Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County IRWM Region has seven GSAs. SGMA implementation is drawing some people away, creating the need

for us to keep people working together on the regional scale so that we're not at cross purposes with one-another.

Getting back to the next level up question, we must be mindful of scale, but I don't know that there is a correct one-size-fits-all answer to this question. We've been working very hard in Ventura County to try to keep these things together and keep people at the table and engaged. The smaller the scale, the easier it is to keep things together. I also want to also reiterate what everybody's been saying about the importance of trust and the relationships, and the need to maintain and build on them. Having trust and positive relationships makes things easier.

Bringing it back to the issue of, how do we use the bottom-up approach for building the [2023] Water Plan? I want to mention that the South Coast Regional Report for Water Plan Update 2013 did not end up being a useful tool for us in our IRWM region. In addition, there wasn't consistency among the different hydrologic region reports. Some regions had more information than others. There wasn't a single, consistent process or approach used to roll up the information across the hydrologic region into the regional reports.

I don't want to be too critical here because it's very hard to do regional [next level up] reports. If you want to develop a regional roll-up report, and you want people at the regional level to really use it, then it'll be a lot of work. You must keep people engaged. You must be able to show people where they will find themselves in the document and convince them that DWR, and other state entities, care about what's in the plan and that they are actually going to look to the IRWM regions as the experts. I think doing that helps people feel more engaged and more empowered in the process.

Brad Sherwood

I represent the home of Grant Davis. There are several things that I think are going in the right direction in terms of engaging locals for this bottom-up approach, which we wholeheartedly support.

The Sonoma County Water Agency is involved in both the North Coast and San Francisco Bay Area IRWM regions. We are in two different regional plans and are involved with two different stakeholder groups that are really worlds apart from each other in terms of needs, assessments, and projects.

When it comes to interagency or inter-regional collaboration, that's tough. A colleague of mine who's here today helps manage the North Coast IRWM Region Plan. I help

manage the San Francisco Bay Area IRWM Plan with Carl Morrison. In many ways Carl acts as our coordinator. Coordinators are needed to help keep all the various groups in an IRWM region together to provide input and collaboration. Carl Morrison is our go-to person in the bay area who works with stakeholders and keeps all the various groups working together in one forward-moving path.

Now saying that, we couldn't do our job without DWR's regional program--Gary Lippner and the regional team, fantastic. It's critical that DWR support funding and staffing for that regional program. Who else is going to do that work? Boots on the ground, that's what's needed.

The 58 County initiative, which Director Davis just described, is vitally important. I am interested to hear how that's going to roll out because, at the county regional level, we're putting the "meat on the bone." The water plan is the "bone" and it's the local agencies and the local and regional plans that are the "meat." So, the question I have is, how do we ensure that meat gets on the bone and stays on the bone, and how do we all get a bite of it?

Speaking more about meat on the bone—IRWM, where is it in the California Water Code? We need to support IRWM; how do we do that? Lisa Renton, who many of you know through the water bond coalition, has these words of advice:

1. Establish baseline funding for IRWM.
2. Add language to the California Water Code recognizing IRWM as a key means of increasing regional self-reliance.
3. State agencies must align policies programs and regulations with IRWM, and that includes the water plan update.

In a nut shell, we're totally supportive of working with DACs, DWR staff, etc. realizing that we locals hold the necessary details and information to make the Water Plan successful. We can do that as long as DWR is supportive of our initiatives and our thoughts, as they have been.

We have been very lucky to have a pilot study for the Russian River, which Charles Gardner with California Forward is running for us. The study will produce metrics and schedules to illustrate how we are working in our watershed. While it might be a relatively small model, it could be replicated for a regional level funding process. It would, among other things, detail stakeholder engagement and the gap between project needs and funding, all of which could be rolled up to the program funding level for the Water Plan.

As Grant Davis pointed out earlier today, the Russian River watershed is a microcosm of the state. We are happy and proud to have been chosen for the pilot study and look forward to implementing it with our partners. We also look forward to sharing that knowledge with the rest of our community. But first and foremost, we must continue to support the DWR regional planning efforts to keep all this going.

Sherri Norris

I'm with the California Indian Environmental Alliance. We work on IRWM and we are the tribal engagement coordinator for the North Coast IRWM Region. We are beholden to thirty-four Tribes in the North Coast Region. The region is very fortunate to have a governance structure that includes the Tribes, but it's not just because of luck, it's because of the efforts of the Tribes and others when the IRWM region was first formed. The way the governance structure is set up, I have bosses and they are the tribal representatives voted in by the thirty-four Tribes. There are six of these representatives, and then there are alternates. There could be as many as twelve people from individual Tribes in that governance structure at any one time.

On the day before each meeting of the North Coast Regional Water Management Group, the Tribes caucus. The purpose of these Tribe-only meetings, which the alliance facilitates, is for the tribal representatives to hear from the Tribes in the area.

We're really excited about the disadvantaged communities program. The program will help increase the participation of all Tribes in the region, to, in turn, help guide the decisions made by those tribal representatives, including directing me what to do.

So, I would say that in this process that we're discussing about including our IRWM plans in the water plan – yes, absolutely, that's a wonderful idea. There's so much work done at the local level, and there's so much trust that's been built in the North Coast IRWM Region between Tribes, counties, and all the agencies; more than what I've seen in other parts of the state. When you have to sit down with everyone and roll up your sleeves to choose what projects get funded, you really get to know people. There were some relationships that started off as being uncomfortable but I've seen some friendships be built out of that.

I am in support of IRWM continuing, helping it guide water management in the state, and using IRWM to support the development of the California Water Plan.

Something that's also important to this discussion is that the goals of the North Coast IRWM Region Tribes are included in the region's IRWM plan. The participation of Tribes in IRWM is only as good as the ability of the regional water management group to include Tribes in their governance structure, and in the development of their IRWM plan.

I'm working in four IRWM regions for the DAC participation program. In the North Coast IRWM region we are calling the disadvantaged community program, "DAC-T" recognizing that disadvantaged communities and tribal communities are not necessarily the same, but that they sometimes have overlapping concerns (imagine a Venn diagram).

One of my hopes is that, in the mountain counties area, the Sacramento River IRWM regions, and the Bay Area IRWM Region, we're able to have space for Tribes to come up with their own governance structure to then be part of the larger regional water management group structures.

Another thing to think about is that Tribes are governments, so that's the other reason that DACs and Tribes are separate terms. The leadership of each Tribe has a responsibility to their constituency that votes them in. When it comes to Tribes, you're actually involving tribal governments who are then reaching out to their communities, which is the most respectful of their sovereignty.

Timing is going to be extremely important in all this. We've struggled over the years with tribal engagement and inclusion in state policies, procedures, and activities to make sure that the tribal part occurs at the right time. If tribal engagement is too late in a process, then it becomes a struggle to get tribal considerations into something after the fact. If tribal engagement is too early, then Tribes don't have an opportunity to weigh in on new decisions that come up after their engagement. So, what we've been saying with regard to consultation, which is yet another topic, is that consultation is supposed to be early and often. This means that you need to engage Tribes from beginning to end because you just don't know which direction things will go during the process.

The other thing to think about as we talk about climate change, and considering forward-looking plans to handle things like drought and flooding, is that the traditional ecological knowledge of Tribes can help. When we think about things like the way a tsunami might hit our coast, or the way that a flood event comes down from the mountains, or why the snowpack isn't there anymore, and then wonder what are we going to do about such things, there is knowledge the tribal community can offer. An example of this knowledge is that kelp beds and coastal wetlands can help reduce the impacts of tsunamis hitting the shore. Similarly, for Oroville, if we had upland meadows

that had beavers, as existed in the past, they would create wide spaces of wetland and habitat for fish, but also make water take a lot longer to hit a reservoir.

So, for whatever planning level we are at, Tribes always want to get to watershed approaches. There are often multiple Tribes that really haven't had an opportunity to talk, or add, on a watershed approach just like we, as counties and other agencies, haven't had those complete headwaters-to-ocean conversations that Tribes are wanting so badly and that I can see as being very useful.

Discussion with the Audience

Audience member: I want to bring attention to the work of the California Water Foundation. They first worked in Sonoma, and then they did some work with Inland Empire Utilities Agency on assessing the sustainable management of water using a profile tool. Part of that innovative work was to first think about, and measure, the stresses that a region is facing, along with the management responses to those stresses.

I'm wonder if part of our problem in figuring out the right scale, is that we are trying to do two things that are at different scales. Thinking about two water management scale considerations, governance (who's in charge of what and where, and at what scale), and the physical environment (where is the water/where is the land), I'm wondering if there's room going forward for us to think about these two considerations of scale. The state could be powerful at saying, "here are the physical conditions of the state related to water that the regions would be responsible for, and for responding to."

Brad Sherwood's response: I think that's a good idea. Would anyone else want to weigh in?

Sherri Norris' response: That reminds me of something I wanted to address earlier, and that's inter-regional support for Tribes. Tribes are often in multiple IRWM regions. You have the boundaries of a tribal area, and then you have all of the other jurisdictional boundaries, along with the hydrologic boundaries. So, as we go through this, or any other process, we need to think about inter-regional support for Tribes.

I know one Tribe that's in four IRWM regions. The Tribe's environmental director has to navigate through all that. So, for any kind of inter-regional funding or support, tribes would need to be involved in multiple hydrological region conversations, in addition to the IRWM regions within their tribal areas.

Brad Sherwood's response: I concur and as you know, Sonoma County Water Agency, as a water wholesaler, has a huge multi-watershed approach extending from Lake County all the way down to the San Francisco Bay. We've done a lot with the pilot study and are supportive of that kind of method.

Lynn Rodriguez's response: I like the idea and I just wanted to say that I think it's good if the Water Plan can, and maybe it has in the past, reflect those things. You can talk about different things at different scales—it can vary widely. For example, you can talk at the hydrologic scale, or the local level about things like disadvantaged community outreach, or other topics. It's important that information at large scales also be brought down and shared at the local scale. All this really makes a lot of sense because it really isn't one-size-fits-all from one thing to another.

Sherri Norris' response: I'm not sure this quite gets to your issue, but I could see, for example, that at hydrologic region level there are some areas of commonality, and maybe we do capture that in the Water Plan. In the south coast area, the majority of us purchase water from the Metropolitan Water District so you know there could be some areas of commonality, but I still think we need to get down to the community and planning area levels to really dive into the issues.

Colin Bailey's response: Thank you, I was going to say almost exactly that. There's a nun in Catalonia that says that democracy only works at a very small scale. The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water and UC Davis had a convening with small water systems from around the state just last week and this issue came up. Small water systems are, I think, uniquely lost in that disconnect between the scale of the problem and the scale of governance. To echo that comment, we would want to make sure that grassroots processes still scaled up to larger scales because, the more attenuated the representative nature of the discussion becomes, the more likely our constituencies will no longer be there. I think it's important for DWR staff, who often take a very neutral position in their facilitator role, to step up in the absence of particular voices and anchor the interests that might not be well represented.

Member of the audience: Thank you all for that discussion. This is actually a question for DWR. If you classify all the IRWM regions into two buckets with one bucket being county-based IRWM regions and the other as multi-county regions, how have the multi-county systems operated? Have you found the multi-county regions to be as effective,

less effective, and more effective than single-county regions? As institutions, we all work within the governance apparatus that that we have. I'm trying to figure out how things work out in the multi-county places.

Art Hinojosa's (DWR) response - It really depends on the county. Using the North Coast IRWM Region as an example, there's a very affluent county (in terms of resources and ability) and then there are others that are not as well off, but they all work together. To be honest, Sonoma County carries a lot of the weight for others in the region, which is very altruistic of them, but they see the value in keeping that group together. In some other places it's, "to each, their own". For the Central Valley, there's still a way to go in many places in terms of getting counties to even participate. So, there really is no simple answer regarding those two buckets, as far as we've seen.

Lynn Rodriguez's response: Speaking as a county-based IRWM region, the advantage to us, besides being contained within the county boundary, is that IRWM has a great connection with land-use planning. The IRWM program I work on is housed in the county chief executive officer's (CEO) office. The county planning department, and all the county agencies, are, to a degree, under the CEO's office. The CEO's office can't dictate their actions, but the CEO's office can influence them.

The planning department is working on the general plan update right now and they are adding a water element, which we will work closely with them on. So, from the standpoint of communication between land-use and water planning (which groundwater sustainability agencies must do), which is so important in urban areas, I think it would be hard if we were linked with other counties.

Sherri Norris' response: In my work I'm sitting at the table with the heads of multiple IRWM regions talking about how this disadvantaged communities program is going to roll out. It will be interesting to see how this could change relationships in a funding region.

Brad Sherwood's response: To add to the multi-county part of the discussion, I think that you perhaps can get more bang for the buck if you have a multi-county regional project. For example, the San Francisco Bay Area IRWM Region, which includes nine bay-area counties, received a \$19 million-dollar grant from DWR to support installing five new storm-tracking radar units. This new radar system not only supports the nine bay-area counties of the IRWM region, it also helps IRWM regions in the Sierras and eastern slope. I think that if we can really think

regionally, and about the average taxpayer and how they want to stretch their dollar, you can get more for less. If you have additional multi-county efforts, you can stretch those dollars and get more benefits.

Regarding the radar project, we are leveraging \$19 million from the state with many millions from local agencies in those individual counties within the Bay Area IRWM Region. It's a huge investment that's truly an integrated regional project and is the largest one in the Bay Area. I think that speaks volumes when you go to the voters and you ask them to pass another bond for this type of funding. So, I would say we all should strive, as much as we can, to have those multi-county efforts.

Tracy Hemmeter

Lew's going to do a quick wrap-up next, but I just want to say thank you very much to all the panelists and thank you to DWR staff. I wrote down a lot of things during the discussion and one thing I heard was the importance of trust and relationships. I guess it never hurts to be repeatedly reminded about how important trust and relationships are. You really can't do anything if you are not able to sit down at the table with someone and make things meaningful for whoever is participating. Just because it's meaningful to me does not mean it's meaningful to anyone else. So, a question to consider is, how do we really make these efforts meaningful so people want to participate? Then lastly, this of course is another promising of a not one-size-fits-all approach, so that will be a challenge as we move forward. So, maybe it needs to be different sizes, at different places, for different reasons.

Lewis Moeller

A lot of things were touched on today, one of those being the pilot studies that we're moving forward with. The studies are going to inform us a lot on how all this [building the 2023 Water Plan] might work. A lot of the discussion today is for the 2023 Water Plan process, but right now we are dealing with the atlas design.

Please pay attention to the recommendations in the draft Water Plan document [for Update 2018] as these recommendations can influence our path forward on all these concepts. Please give us your feedback, especially on Chapter 3, so we can incorporate it in the 2018 update.

Biographical Summaries

Panel Moderator

Tracy Hemmester is a senior project manager for the Santa Clara Valley Water District in San Jose. She leads the district's participation in IRWM efforts in the Pajaro River Watershed in the Central Coast Funding Area and in the San Francisco Bay Area. She also co-chairs the IRWM Roundtable of Regions, an ad hoc coalition of regions from across the state. She is also responsible for the district's local and regional water supply planning efforts, including developing and updating the district's water supply and infrastructure master plan, which guides investments in securing long-term water supply reliability, and participating in the Bay Area Regional Reliability program. Tracy has experience working on a variety of groundwater management, water quality, recycled water, and water supply planning projects and programs.

Panel Members (in speaking order)

Lewis Moeller is currently chief of the Water Resources Evaluation Section, Division of Statewide Integrated Water Management at DWR. In this role, Lewis plans, organizes, coordinates, and directs a team of DWR staff for the development of the California Water Plan. Previously, Lewis worked for almost 20 years with the State Water Board in a variety of roles associated with both water rights and water quality. He also served as an adjunct instructor in the science department at American River College for more than 12 years. Lewis received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from California State University, Sacramento, and is a California-licensed professional civil engineer.

Colin Bailey is the Executive Director and Managing Attorney of The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW). An accomplished social justice attorney, Colin supports EJCW's statewide policy agenda, local and regional programs, and grassroots member organizations. Building upon California's historic adoption of the Human Right to Water Policy in 2012, EJCW supports the grassroots effort to implement and enforce the mandate for safe, clean, affordable water for all, statewide. Fun factoid: Colin once got a standing ovation in Lima, Peru for his Karaoke rendition of Queen's "Bohemian Rhapsody," for which he single-handedly attempted to sing in three-part harmony.

Dana Frieauf is a Water Resources Manager at the San Diego County Water Authority. She has been with the Water Authority for close to thirty years, working in the fields of water resources and facility planning. Ms. Frieauf manages water supply planning and policy activities for the Water Authority. She is responsible for the preparation and update of the region's long-term water demand forecast and supply planning documents, including the Water Authority's Urban Water Management Plan and Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. She was also involved in creation of the Water Authority's

Water Shortage and Drought Response Plan along with implementation of the Plan during the last two shortage periods. Prior to joining the Water Authority, Ms. Frieauf worked for the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and the Goleta Water District in Santa Barbara County. She has a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from San Diego State University, and is a registered civil engineer.

Lynn Rodriguez has worked in the field of water resource management since 1981, focused primarily in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. She has managed the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County IRWM Program since 2005. She authored the two IRWM plans for the region and she manages the ongoing stakeholder process. Lynn also serves as co-chair of the statewide IRWM Roundtable of Regions and the LA-Ventura Funding Area Disadvantaged Community Involvement Task Force. She has served on numerous local, statewide, and national committees addressing water management issues.

Brad Sherwood has worked in the California water industry for 15 years with both the Association of California Water Agencies and the Sonoma County Water Agency. As the community and government affairs manager at the water agency, Brad coordinates multi-faceted and innovative federal and State legislative programs. Brad represents the water agency at legislative hearings and serves as the media spokesperson. Working directly with the water agency's board of directors and general manager, Brad coordinates high-level relationships that represent special project and innovation initiatives. Brad is actively representing the water agency throughout the Bay Area through the San Francisco Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Program, Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition, North Bay Watershed Association, and North Bay Water Reuse Authority. Other regional collaborations that Brad is involved in include his upcoming position as chair of the ACWA Region One Board of Directors. Brad has a master's degree in political management from the George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and a bachelor's degree in government/journalism from California State University, Sacramento. Brad is a native, fifth generation Californian, born and raised in Elk Grove. He currently resides in Santa Rosa with his wife and two small children. Brad remains active in his community by coaching soccer, baseball, and volunteering at the local school.

Sherri Norris is the executive director of the California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA) – a California Indian environmental health organization that provides California Tribes, tribal members, and health care providers with training and decision-making tools to avoid toxins including mercury, PCBs, and more recently, cyanobacteria in fish. CIEA's Tribal Self-Advocacy Program promotes increased water quality in partnership with California Tribes for the advancement of safe subsistence food security. As part of this program, Sherri is the lead tribal engagement coordinator for the North Coast, Upper Feather River, Bay Area, and CABY IRWM Regions. She has served in an advisory capacity in the creation of regional fish consumption advisories, educational outreach programs, total maximum daily loads, and IRWM program development, and she has

recently joined the Tribal Advisory Committee for Water Plan Update 2018. Sherri is a member of the Sierra Fund's Blue-Ribbon Panel of mercury experts and is a recipient of the Sierra Crest Award and the Mills College Brave Hearted Women Award. Sherri will work with the PMT and subcommittee under Task 1 to develop a tribal steering committee which will be tasked with developing a tribal outreach strategy.

Set Up Presentation

Mike Floyd's 38-year career in water resources includes positions with DWR's Statewide Water Resources Planning Team, Integrated Regional Water Management Program, Suisun Marsh Program, Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program, and Water Quality Evaluations Program. He also served as DWR's staff groundwater hydrology specialist and well standards specialist. Mike also held positions with the State Water Resource Control Board's Division of Water Rights and Division of Water Quality, preceded by a position with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Prior to working for the State, Mike was a project manager and hydrologist at two nationally-based consulting firms, preceded by employment with the University of Arizona, Department of Hydrology and Water Resources conducting research for the development and evaluation of groundwater models. Mike worked for a geotechnical engineering firm in Santa Barbara, California as a teenager. Mike is a California Registered Professional Engineer and has served as a planning commissioner for the City of Dixon, California, and as a member of the city's Wastewater Advisory Committee. Mike enjoys time off with his family and is obsessed with motorcycles.